

A  
L E T T E R  
ON THE  
MEETING AT THE CROWN AND ANCHOR  
TAVERN,

ON THE FOURTEENTH OF JULY, 1791,  
FOR THE PURPOSE OF CELEBRATING  
THE ANNIVERSARY OF  
THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE.

ADDRESSED TO THE  
*PATRONS AND STEWARDS OF THAT MEETING,*  
BY THE  
Rev. RICE HUGHES, A. M.  
OF ALDENHAM, HERTS;  
*DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HON. THE  
EARL POULETT.*

WITH A  
*P O S T S C R I P T,*  
ON THE ADDRESS AND DECLARATION, PUBLISHED BY  
AN ADJOURNED MEETING, AT THE THATCHED-  
HOUSE TAVERN, AUGUST 20, 1791,  
SIGNED, J. H. TOOKE, CHAIRMAN.

---

*“ Ea demum Angliæ Libertas est, non Senatum, non Magistratus,  
non Leges, non Mores Majorum, non Instituta Patrum vereri.”*

---

L O N D O N:  
PRINTED BY W. WOODFALL,  
AND SOLD BY J. STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY.

---

Price One Shilling and Six-pence.



10 47 9  
264



---

## ADVERTISEMENT.

*THE following Letter and Postscript will best explain their object and tendency; and, therefore, the Author submits them, without any previous comment, to the judgment of his readers. The former was first sent to the Printer of the Diary, and intended for publication in that paper, on the day of the Anniversary; but owing to its length, it was necessarily reduced into detached portions, which were successively inserted. Since its publication in that form, several friends of the author, zealous for the government, and attached to the constitution of this country, advised him to collect the divided passages, and present them to the people in the following shape, conceiving that the principles it supports, and the doctrines it inculcates, might render it useful at this critical period, when certain restless spirits are endeavouring, with malicious industry, to undermine the established foundations of legitimate society, and substitute a wild spirit of popular enthusiasm, as well as impracticable theories of political equality.*

---

E R R A T A.

*Page 11, line 4 from the bottom for general revelation,  
read genuine revelation.*

*Page 18, line 5 from the bottom, for uniformity, read  
conformity.*

*Page 24, line 12, for reputable, read respectable.*

*Page 43, line 13 and 14, instead of becomes, read become.*

*Page 44, line 7, read a desperate faction.*

---

---

▲

L E T T E R  
TO THE  
STEWARDS AND PATRONS  
OF THE  
ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION  
IN FRANCE, &c.

---

GENTLEMEN,

**L**IVING as I do in a situation remote from public life, and neither having had, nor wishing to have any communication with your Society, great was my surprize at the receipt of a printed letter, by the post, bearing the stamp of your authority, to invite me to join the *friends of liberty*,

B

in



in London, to celebrate an event in France, in which we had no concern, unless it is that of painful sympathy; an event, whose prominent features are those of anarchy, cruelty, injustice, and the most violent paroxysm of popular frenzy and infatuation that ever afflicted a body politic; an event too, fraught with the most direful and disastrous consequences.

The emancipation of a people from tyranny and despotism, under prudent and salutary restrictions, must, indeed, be a subject of gratulation and joy to every generous Briton: But tyranny and despotism have not ceased their operation in France. That arbitrary power, lately in the hands of a humane individual, who had, *during his imprisonment*, forgotten his own misfortunes in the contemplation of those of his subjects, and had evinced the greatest tenderness for their happiness; that despotic power, which he inherited from his ancestors, is usurped by a legion of tyrants. The  
last



last state of that devoted nation must be worse than the first.

The Revolution in France, then, cannot be a subject of *present* exultation. In the annals of nations, there never has occurred an event, portentous of greater calamities and bloodshed.

Can it be supposed that a Prince so powerfully allied, yet treated with ferocious indignity; that Peers degraded from their hereditary rights; that a Clergy plundered of their revenues; will submit, unresistingly, to the levelling hand of rebellion, violence, sacrilege, and injustice.

The alienation of the revenues of religious establishments, which have a sanction of right from the authority of God, and the most ancient usages—revenues that have proceeded from the commendable munificence of pious individuals; their alienation, I say, is the greatest possible outrage and encroachment on the boasted rights of men and Christians, and must terminate in the

subversion of order and decency; nay, of the very existence of religion, the foundation of all government.

Twenty-five millions of people in a state of anarchy; a royal family imprisoned, and insulted, awaiting in dread suspense the *patriotic ministers of death!* Britons! Is this a subject of exultation? It can be an object of delight only to unfeeling barbarians!

The printed letter I allude to is pregnant with deep design, perfidy, and danger. I spurned the seditious summons with that indignation it deserved.

I am aware of the disadvantages arising to a man in private life from interfering in the discussion of public topics. Offence must be supposed, where none is intended.

At a juncture like the present, however, the mirror of faction must be held up to the public eye, that its deformity may be discerned, and its views frustrated.

The political horizon of this country wears a gloomy aspect; its elements are in a state of fermentation. It behoves every friend to his King and country, to sound the alarm of danger from the impending storm, that they may guard against its consequence.

It is suggested, that your Society is hostile to our happy Constitution—I have no doubt on the subject.

Many absurd principles concerning Government have of late been disseminated with unusual industry *from a certain source*. Every engine is in motion, every machination employed to instil groundless fears and jealousies into the people, to unsettle the minds of the credulous and ignorant, to disturb the public peace, and to overwhelm the established system of Government in confusion and disorder. The most licentious paragraphs issue forth from certain abandoned and republican prints, to fan the embers of civil discord, unqualified in terms of sedition. Turbulent  
and



and impatient of controul—jealous of rivals, and affecting the honourable love of liberty, you form confederacies to strengthen your interest, to augment your numbers.

Your language is,—“ Come cast in thy lot among us, let us have one purse; we shall find all precious substance; we shall adorn our houses with spoil.” Of the *Clergy* and *those in power*, you seem to say, “ *these* are the *heirs*; come let us kill them and seize on their inheritance.” Such is the manifest object and tendency of your intrigues, persuasions, and cabals.

I would not be understood to speak to the prejudice of the opposition in general. There are men among them of talents and integrity, of public virtue, and elevated rank. Right sorry am I to say, however, that disingenuous artifices, the result of envy and disappointment, proceed from the party, and, too palpable not to be discerned, are used to fully the popularity of an  
adminis-



administration, which, in my humble opinion, have a strong claim on the gratitude of their countrymen.

I trust, that, however envy may fret, faction storm, and malice accuse, they will have support and fortitude sufficient to promote the good of the public, preserve its tranquillity, secure the prosperity of the Church, and maintain a *rational* system of civil and religious liberty.

To speak plain, I can consider your Society in no other light than as agents of a *disappointed faction*, of the *subtlety of the Dissenters*, and of Gallic policy and finesse.

You want to impress the body of the public with the opinion, that to remove particular individuals from the public administration, and to re-place them with *your friends*, would be a certain measure to ensure the most essential national advantages; forgetting, that those who *now* complain of the exorbitant power of administration, when

*in*

*in office* not only experience, but sanction the absolute necessity of influence to give effect to the essential measures of Government.

Montesquieu is of opinion, that *factions* are necessary to a free Government. In order to judge of their utility or danger, we should ascertain their object. I scruple not to own, if they proceed from freedom of opinion, and aim at the public welfare, they are salutary—and I am equally bold to say, if their source is selfish interest (Is it not *now* so?) they are dangerous and destructive.

The loudest advocates for liberty in theory, are the greatest tyrants in practice. That which constitutes a patriot in a *subject*, in a *King* creates a *tyrant*.

I appeal to experience in our own country.

The wretched state of anarchy to which this nation was reduced at the period of Cromwellian usurpation, should be a warning to all querulous innovators, and to the community at large.

Did

Did *civil* and *religious* liberty prevail on the abolition of monarchy and episcopal government? Was there a greater liberty of conscience? No! National citizens were oppressed. The *superior sect* condemned the toleration not merely of the *national* church, but even of its *fellow sectaries* as unchristian.

———*En quo discordia cives  
Perduxit miseros.*

At a juncture when the public tranquillity is attempted to be disturbed, private considerations should be sacrificed to the public weal; and Clergy as well as Laity, being alike citizens of the state, should dare to speak the language of loyalty, and unite their endeavours to preserve the national peace.

I have been bold to say, that your Society were dupes to a turbulent and ambitious faction; to the subtlety of an heterogeneous body of discontented and aspiring separatists, to Gallic perfidy and finesse.

C

The



*in office* not only experience, but sanction the absolute necessity of influence to give effect to the essential measures of Government.

Montesquieu is of opinion, that *factions* are necessary to a free Government. In order to judge of their utility or danger, we should ascertain their object. I scruple not to own, if they proceed from freedom of opinion, and aim at the public welfare, they are salutary—and I am equally bold to say, if their source is selfish interest (Is it not *now* so?) they are dangerous and destructive.

The loudest advocates for liberty in theory, are the greatest tyrants in practice. That which constitutes a patriot in a *subject*, in a *King* creates a *tyrant*.

I appeal to experience in our own country.

The wretched state of anarchy to which this nation was reduced at the period of Cromwellian usurpation, should be a warning to all querulous innovators, and to the community at large.

Did



Did *civil* and *religious* liberty prevail on the abolition of monarchy and episcopal government? Was there a greater liberty of conscience? No! National citizens were oppressed. The *superior sect* condemned the toleration not merely of the *national* church, but even of its *fellow sectaries* as unchristian.

—————*En quo discordia cives  
Perduxit miseros.*

At a juncture when the public tranquillity is attempted to be disturbed, private considerations should be sacrificed to the public weal; and Clergy as well as Laity, being alike citizens of the state, should dare to speak the language of loyalty, and unite their endeavours to preserve the national peace.

I have been bold to say, that your Society were dupes to a turbulent and ambitious faction; to the subtlety of an heterogeneous body of discontented and aspiring separatists, to Gallic perfidy and finesse.

C

The

The transactions of a *dark* period in the political occurrences of this country, will impress an indelible memorial, replete with horror and detestation, on the minds of Englishmen to the latest posterity.

It is here to be observed, that these nefarious and diabolical transactions originated, from the wily machinations of *spurious* patriotism. The leading actors in this tragic scene professed a wonderful zeal for religion and liberty! but their *patriotism* was *ambition*, and their *godliness*—*gain*! The confederated sons of Belial—parricides and relentless oppressors, while they assassinated the King, murdered the constitution.

The *manager* upon this bloody theatre (the principles of whose adherents were congenial with his own) in his proud passion for the *Lord's cause* (what impious and execrable hypocrisy!) was not unmindful of his *own*, but usurped a power more arbitrary and tyrannical, than a British Monarch ever possessed.

O Liberty!

O Liberty ! Goddess of Englishmen's adoration ! how art thou abused and prostituted to the vilest purposes ! The sanction of thy sacred name is applied to principles and measures fraught with thy own destruction, tending to deprive thee of thy ancient inheritance, and to banish thee from thy favourite land !

And Religion, too ! that angel of peace and good-will among men, is perverted, and rendered an unseemly cause of strife and contention, of anarchy and disorder.

If we trace rebellion from the grand author and parent of it (*viz. the Devil*) to the little sectaries and republicans of our own time, we shall find that all mutinies, insurrections, conspiracies and disturbances, have generally proceeded from erroneous and distorted notions in religion.

Where general revelation (retained and professed with peculiar purity in the Church of England, whose articles of faith are approved by the generality



of Dissenters) where revelation, I say, has not been perverted by designing and politic men, the nation has been *united*, and our Sovereigns made happy, by the untainted loyalty and obedience of their subjects.

False notions of religion and liberty inspire the most atrocious actions. A despotic monarch is to be deprecated by every friend of liberty ; but from tumultuous freedom, good Providence deliver us !

In a free government there must, of necessity, be opposite and contending parties. Power and lucrative employments are objects of solicitude and strife. Places are not so numerous as claimants. From disappointed and unsatisfied avarice and ambition, the spirit of a selfish faction grows impatient. Political uproar begins. Every artifice is employed to obstruct ministerial measures, and to distress government.

We have heard of a desperado, that, from misguided zeal, meditated the ex-



tirpation of King, Lords, and Commons, in a summary way, at the risk of his own personal safety. There *may* be *those*, who, from competition and envy, would compass the destruction of their country, though they suffered in the general wreck. But *their* measures must be progressive and more subtle, and wear the appearance at least of popular tendency.

Hence a faction must conciliate the attachment of those who have every thing to gain, but nothing to lose. The French Revolution seems to be an event propitious to their views; it yields a plausible pretence for a *new* arrangement of things. As if that fickle and volatile nation were infallible.

The doctrine that brings their superiors down to their own level, in rank and circumstances, will be greedily embraced by those who have neither merit to raise them into elevated stations and public confidence, or diligence to attain conveniencies and importance  
from

from the acquisitions of industry; nor yet even prudence and œconomy to preserve that property which they inherit from their ancestors.

There is another description of men whose circumstances may not be so desperate, but who, notwithstanding, would avail themselves of an opportunity to *force* their way into power and emolument in Church and State; men excluded from confidential situations, from woeful experience of their avowed hostility to government.

But the zealous advocates for *perfect* religious liberty attack us with this triumphant question:—What has Government to do with men's religion? I reply by proposing another question—Do not certain religious opinions influence political conduct, and militate against government? Beyond a doubt! There are men among the Dissenters, who possess so much moderation and wisdom, as to wish no alteration in the present system of government, who admit the  
necessity

necessity of a national religious establishment to preserve purity and uniformity in religion; to promote due subordination, the essence of society; to enjoin obedience to legal governors as a moral duty, and in conformity to the example of Our Saviour, and the worthies who bore his sacred commission. They acknowledge that the members of the Church of England are the only friends to universal toleration, who make no discrimination of sects in the line of business, who are as ready to encourage an honest Dissenter as any of their own profession. Examine the large catalogue of sectaries, and point out one so superior to narrow prejudice.

The vehemence of opposition from the Dissenters to extend toleration to Papists, recoils upon themselves. The tenets of both persuasions are alike repugnant to the principles of government. Those restrictions, the cause of such heavy complaints, their tumultuous excesses have provoked; restraints  
that



that are not merely salutary, but of eternal and indispensable necessity for the safety of our excellent constitution.

Let us observe a few characteristic traits in our modern Reformers. The first champion in rank and talents for an indiscriminate religious liberty, some people are ready to say, has no predilection for any mode of worship in particular. This is, however, no man's concern but his own. I have long been in the habit of contemplating this political phenomenon with veneration and astonishment. His conduct, however, on the late attempt to repeal the Test Acts, and his repeated declaration, that "the French Revolution was one of the most glorious fabricks ever raised by human integrity," excites in me jealousy and fear. And if the sentence above quoted really proceeded from his own lips, I humbly conceive it to be an exception to his usual correctness as an orator. This glorious Revolution is execrable rebellion; and the fabrick, a  
vision;

vision; or resembling, rather, the Tower of Babel; and the National Assembly, like its artificers, characterised by chaos and confusion, violence and disorder.

With regard to the next champion, as he is now no more, I shall content myself with saying, that his principles are still living, and his adherents numerous. It is well known how they are affected towards our civil and religious policy.

The last and not the *least* in the list of Reformers, makes a great noise in the cause of turbulent patriotism. This demagogue strikes at the very root of Christianity, as well as our happy constitution. The man that is bold enough to deny the Godhead of our Saviour, and to hurl the King of Kings from the throne of the universe, may be presumed to entertain few scruples respecting the rights of an earthly monarch, his vicegerent.

D

Shall

Shall we, O my countrymen! consign the liberty of our consciences and of our civil rights, to the disposal and protection of such men?

Should I, upon this important subject, recite to you the conduct of our Saviour, of the Prophets, of the Apostles, of the primitive Christians, and Martyrs, I must ransack the Bible, and transcribe a great part of antiquity. The uniform tenor of their conduct was obedience, submission, and fidelity, to their respective governments.

The example of the Son of God should be particularly exhibited for our imitation. *He* was humble and respectful towards his superiors in civil rank; a good subject to the Roman Emperor, though a tyrant, to whose authority he paid all due deference, uniformity and submission. *He* never disturbed the state by factions and seditions, and even wrought a miracle to enable him to give tribute to whom tribute was due.

Blush,



Blush, and be confounded, ye that profess his name; but act in contradiction to his precepts and example!

The more religious men are, the greater advocates they will prove for government. This is also exemplified in miriads of the best and wisest of our ancestors. In all ages of the world, those who have been eminent for their piety, have been eminent for their loyalty; the same principle that exacts their obedience to the King of Heaven, determines their subjection to his vicerent on earth.

I contend, in defiance of all the arguments of our adversaries, that there is an *essential* reciprocity of dependance between church and state. Without obedience and submission, no government can subsist, Religion enjoins obedience and submission to civil power, as a moral duty, with the awful sanction of future rewards and punishments; religion, therefore, must be the only durable foundation of all civil government.

Hence Princes are said to be its nursing fathers, and it becomes their interest as well as duty to establish and maintain a church whose doctrines are pure, whose rites correspond with the solemnity of divine worship, and whose ministers are trained, by a long series of laborious studies, for the proper discharge of its sacred functions.

There is a striking analogy between the natural body and body politic. The ecclesiastical or spiritual part of the constitution is its *soul*; *their* violent separation as certainly infers the dissolution of our government, as the disjunction of soul and body terminates natural life.

The two interests of our religious and civil polity are to the state, what the elements of fire and water are to the body, which united, compose; separated, destroy it. Let us then beware of political quacks, who promise a *sovereign* cure of our maladies, but *destroy our constitution*.

What

What the voice of experience and the sound policy of our ancestors have joined together, let no man put asunder. But it is said, that the object of your meeting is to abolish the alliance between these two friends. An enemy divided, becomes less formidable! *How far* your views extend, it is difficult to divine; perhaps, it may not be known to yourselves. It is my opinion, that the generality of you are less principals, than puppets set in motion by an *invisible* power.

Some are ready to think that your association originated, and is encouraged, on the other side of the channel. Is it possible that Englishmen can join in the measures of our natural enemies, to set us upon cutting each other's throats?

Frenchmen stimulated the Americans to rebellion, and effected their separation from their parent country for ever.

It has ever been the diabolical and treacherous policy of our eternal enemies to weaken a rival kingdom, by  
pro-



promoting its internal dissensions; and notwithstanding *Gallic faith* and perfidy are so notorious as to become proverbial, we greedily catch at every lure they throw out to us, and resemble the lamb described by the poet (not so much in innocence, as in want of foresight) "That licks the hand just raised to shed its blood." Our history has recorded a fact, not inapposite to the present times, and which we should always bear in mind.

In the rebellion against the Royal Martyr, it is an incontrovertible truth, that the Dissenters and Cardinal Richelieu of France, were always intriguing; both desired a civil war; the one to depress the great, and seize on the inheritance of the church; the other, to humble the kingdom.

*Felicitis is sapit, qui alieno periculo sapit.*

PLAUT.

Attend, O my countrymen! to the object and tendency of this day's celebrity.

But

But before I proceed, let us point a wistful glance at the envied fabric—the Constitution of England. In the contemplation of the harmony and symmetry of all its parts, my mind is filled with awe, reverence, and admiration. My heart glows with enthusiasm. Let me then, Gentlemen, *rather exult* in the *glorious* birth-right of a Briton, upon the basis of wise laws and good order.

This is an elevated subject for discussion, but the limits of a letter, which are already exceeded, will not admit of it. Monarchy, as it exists in England, is the first and most perfect of all governments. It is the *image* of the divine supremacy. The constitution of this country is also the most finished and accurate *system of liberty, compatible* with government. The kingly power, not only bounded by just and equitable laws, but distinguished by a willing clemency and justice. The Sovereign, for *genuine* patriotism, for piety, for every virtue, public and private, social  
and

and domestic; as a Prince, and as a Christian, is equalled by few, excelled by none upon the face of the globe. Such an amiable character must surely endear him to our affections, consecrate him to our veneration, and challenge our loyalty and allegiance. Abandoned by men, be the faction that will disturb the peace and tranquillity of such a prince!

The people, also, by their representatives in Parliament, form a reputable and important branch of the legislature, by which they acquire a consequence, nay, a majesty in the state, which secures to them protection and reverence!

The nobility constitute the other branch of the legislature, with distinct privileges and powers. These privileges being always obnoxious to popular envy; of course in a free state are always in danger. Considerable power must be necessary for their preservation, and essentially requisite for the safety of the Constitution. The nobility having  
views



views and interests dissimilar to those of the Commons, they operate as mutual checks upon each other. Hence the aristocratic branch of the system moderates the influence of prerogative, and restrains the encroaching enterprizes of the people.

A critical period may not be far distant, when Englishmen will esteem and revere the illustrious peerage of the realm, as the guardians of its Constitution.

(In France, *you* think they have ordered things better. What a *glorious* cause of exultation must the subject of your meeting be to our English Nobility!)

Our political existence demands that the respective constitutional powers of the three states should be poised in the nicest equilibrium; for if the balance of power preponderates in either scale, the fabric falls and perishes.

The general object of a mixed government is the same, to avoid on the

E

one

one hand tyranny, and on the other anarchy.

To form a proper estimate of the present political situation of Government, we must consider the comparative strength and weakness of the several parts of which our system is composed.

That our country is in a state of declension from the zenith of its domestic happiness and glory, I fear, cannot be denied.

It is my humble opinion, however, that the cause does not proceed from *Prerogative*, or from *Mal-administration*, which, I believe, on the contrary to be meritorious ; nor is any danger to be apprehended from that quarter ; nor yet from the late extension of the Peerage, which the circumstances of the times made essentially necessary ; and the measure reflects a lustre on the sound policy of the Minister.

Every candid and impartial man must allow, notwithstanding it has been lately asserted that the influence of  
the

the Crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished, that Government, by progressive steps, has been strongly drawn towards democracy. The danger, then, is to be expected from the misapplication of those abused and indefinite terms, "Liberty," and the "People."

The question is not what right we have to liberty, but what degree of it is compatible with our political welfare? It is the wildest and most extravagant absurdity to reason from supposed natural rights. The natural state of man is by no means a state of independance, but that of subordination. Man is obliged to submit to the constitution and laws of that country in which he resides, and is justly hanged, for refractoriness and disobedience.

What preposterous absurdities arise from reasoning from speculative principles, as is the case in France, without attending to practicability and experience. It is the united voice of reason



and of experience, that liberty in excess accomplishes its own destruction.

An excess of liberty, or in other words, an excess of popular power, produces anarchy, and must ever be the bane of such a Government as our's. The Roman constitution perished under the *usurpation* of the people. The extension of democratic power may produce, *if not timely prevented*, a similar dissolution in Britain; but, be it observed, not from any corruption of the legislative body, but from the general corruption of the people.

Seeing then that the balance of power preponderates in the popular scale; seeing that private and public solicitations are urged with unremitting industry; and inflammatory pamphlets, paragraphs, and speeches, are obtruded upon the public with more than Jesuitical zeal and artifice, to gain converts to the cause of delusive patriotism; seeing that a body of citizens dare assemble in the very heart of the metropolis, to celebrate

celebrate what they insidiously call a Glorious Revolution, a Revolution whose *glorious* circumstances are those of having exterminated monarchy; of having deprived the Nobility of their *birth-rights*; of having, with impious sacrilege, plundered and impoverished the Clergy, who have as inalienable a right to their respective portions of the patrimony of the Church, as any individual of the National Assembly, that has any, to his private property.

What are we to infer, then, from the avowed designs of a certain Society? Whether they assemble by sound of trumpet, or by the circulation of printed letters; whether in St. George's Fields, or at the Crown and Anchor; in the latter indeed, the fumes of wine may incite greater tumults; otherwise, I can see no difference!—What are we to conclude from their design? What, but that the Parliament of England might become a National Assembly; that kingly power might be reduced to  
a non-

a non-entity; and the sacred person of Majesty, perhaps imprisoned, vilified, insulted, and abased; that the patrimony of the church might become the patrimony of "the people?" that there might be an indiscriminate access to places of profit and public confidence, regardless of *requisite qualifications*; that the most obscure mechanics in Spital-Fields, or the purlieus of St. Giles's, might hold an equal rank with the most elevated characters in Christendom; in short, that all external distinctions be abrogated, all subordination cease, and anarchy and confusion reign triumphant!

Such a levelling scheme would dry up the source of emulation. Ignorance and sloth would supersede genius and industry. The reign of monarchy, of science, and of literature, would be ingulphed together in so *glorious* a Revolution.

Away



Away with such an extravagant supposition. While parental affection and regard for the happiness and comfort of their descendants glow in British hearts; while relatives wish to transmit to relatives the fruits of their industry, and the honours which the gratitude of their country has conferred upon them for eminent public services; while the love of property, order, and liberty, is not extinct among us; and reason is not absorbed in madness and stupidity; the stability of the inimitable fabric of our constitution will resemble the rocky barriers of our shores, against which the billows of faction may storm and roar, but, like the boisterous element under our cliffs, must retreat murmuring from the fruitless conflict.

British ground has already been too much steeped with British blood. Policy and true wisdom will guard against even possible events of danger and sanguinary strife.

There is a certain sympathy in the human system, which, actuated by congeniality of sentiment, disposes the passions to be excited to a dangerous degree of fury, which, like the homogeneous nature of combustible ingredients, a spark will kindle, and the *explosion* will be proportionate to their respective accumulation.

Disloyalty is ever timid in its beginning. From lenity and connivance it grows bold and gathers progressive strength. Hence the necessity of precaution to discountenance and repress tumultuous associations at their commencement. If checked in time, they shrink like self-convicted criminals, before the resolute arm of justice; and ignobly sink into oblivion.

I beg leave, with the greatest deference, to lay before the public only a few remarks more: for to *them* the tenor of this letter is particularly addressed.

A levelling

A levelling principle, which would seem to be the principle of the times, has a wonderful influence upon the passions of the people. Its tendency is to incite them to GLORIOUS enterprises.

When they are told, that men are born *free* and *equal*; and yet they themselves are oppressed with poverty, and condemned to labour, while they behold their superiors enjoy ease, and all the pomps and luxuries of life; when they are told that all government is derived from the people (which by the bye is a problematical position) and that "the people" have a right to redress the supposed grievances in Church and State; as well as those which in their chimerical notions result from the usurped superiority in rank and affluence, and the slavishness of subordination; little persuasion will suffice to rouse them to the attempt of *restoring* the *invaded rights* of man by *violence* and *injustice*, by *rapine* and *bloodshed*.

F

But



But whom do our modern demagogues distinguish by the term—"the people?" Not the hereditary Peers of the realm; they are creatures of the Crown: Not the representatives of this very people in parliament; for they barter their constituents: Not the pastors of the Church; they monopolize the loaves and fishes: Neither the magistrates, who are the guardians of the public safety; nor yet the possessors of landed property, the opulent stockholder, nor the wealthy merchant:—They are, forsooth, tools of power; because they have a *share* in the country and wish to preserve it.

Who then are to be our Solons and Lycurguses? Who?—The reformers of the state—lovers of their country—patriots! A *London Mob!* consisting of free-booters and assassins, that in myriads infest the metropolis, and assemble on public occasions in the cause of Liberty—to plunder! These are the men that determine the popular estimation  
of

of statesmen, and whose voice is the supposed echo of the collective voice of the community at large.

The defenders of our liberties are to be those who only regard the liberty of depredation.—The protectors of our properties—those—who have none of their own to defend, but whose object is to gain as much as they can from the general wreck.

We have long been free and unmolested in our legal rights and immunities, without invasion, without infringement.

I would not forbode evil to my country. I am confident, in the words of a real and distinguished patriot, and an honour to human nature, that *the body is sound*, “ though some of its members are *infected*.”

I have observed that an increase of power is thrown into the popular scale. Unless public virtue and the friends of the constitution interfere to control the efforts of an aspiring faction, and a tu-

multuous rabble—Unless those should interpose, whose proper duty and peculiar interest it is, to resist the increasing torrent of popular phrenzy, the Constitution will be endangered ; I will not say destroyed.

In the establishment, I trust, every cause of complaint, if there exists any, will be *seasonably* removed. In the State I know of none. The patrimony of the Church is a sacred trust, vested in those who enjoy it ; particularly its rulers and dignitaries, who ought to transmit its revenues unimpaired to their successors. We have seen how they have managed things in France. While we avoid the rock on which the Gallic Church was ship-wrecked, the Sons of the Church of England, I mean its Lay-Sons, the Clergy naturally, and the Friends of the Constitution of course, will never desert her but with the extinction of their lives.

It is to the Temporal in conjunction with the Spiritual Peers that we are to  
look



look up, to restore the proper tone and due equipoise to the State; and to preserve it from the Gallic contagion.

I do not know what the personal merits of the French Nobility were, nor those of their ancestors. Of this I am confident, that the body of the Peerage in this kingdom, with respect to illustrious descent, and personal worth, are the brightest ornaments in the annals of the most renowned States, from the earliest ages of the world.

Our Bishops, too, are men raised to their high stations from the purity of their manners, the profundity of their erudition, their loyalty to their King, and their eminent zeal and exertions in cause of their divine Master.

If, my Lords, and my fellow-citizens, we shew the same indefatigable zeal and industry; if we labour to defend, as our adversaries do, to ruin our excellent Constitution; neither the united efforts of the National Assembly in France, of their friends in England, no,  
not

not the gates of hell, shall prevail against it.

The interesting nature of my subject led me imperceptibly very far beyond the bounds I at first proposed to this letter. I have to apologize to a candid public for taking up so much room in a print so eminently distinguished for its resources of much more important information, and more interesting entertainment. I must also express my acknowledgment to the Proprietor of the DIARY for his ready insertion of the sentiments of an obscure individual, who has nothing to recommend them to the public attention, but their being the heart-felt effusions of his loyalty to his King, and of his attachment to the Constitution of his Country.

With regard to you, Gentlemen, I beg leave to subscribe myself

A *Dissenter* from your Society, but  
your sincere well-wisher as individual peaceful Citizens,

RICE HUGHES.

---

---

## POSTSCRIPT.

**T**HOUGH the author of the foregoing letter has combated, in a cursory manner, the principles maintained by the friends of the Gallic Revolution in this country ; yet, as an address and declaration has been recently published by an adjourned meeting of these men at the Thatched-house Tavern, he thinks it a duty incumbent upon him to bestow a few moments upon the subject of that declaration, merely for the purpose of noticing what appears to be of the most insidious, mischievous, and alarming complexion.

At a period when so many more able writers have stood forth in the defence of the English Constitution, the author of these strictures expects to be reckoned arrogant and assuming ; to be stigmatized as the friend of aristocratic rule, or



regal tyranny. Conscious of the integrity of his intentions, he will speak his opinion, unawed by the frowns and criticisms of those whose views aim to inflame factions, and to introduce a scene of lawless confusion in the state.

The said address is inflammatory and bombastic. It begins with complaints of "wilful misrepresentations" of their principles and motives, "by the partizans of arbitrary power, and the advocates of Court-government." Thus in the first instance, these demagogues oppose themselves to the friends of legal monarchy! Their language supposes the existence of arbitrary sway in Britain, whose glory is—a regular and equitable system of freedom. It breathes, nay, avows a disaffection to Court-government.

Alluding to the Revolution in France, they say, "We rejoice in the prospect which such a magnificent example opens to the world"—To England of course. "The French have laid the axe to the  
root

root of tyranny," (that is to say, of Court-government) have levelled all ranks, and extinguished all subordination. " They have bound their King with chains, and their Nobles with fetters of iron. " Such is the magnificent example which is presumed to gladden the world, and is held up for our imitation.

The French are said to be " erecting " government on the sacred hereditary " rights of man.—Rights which appertain to *all*, and not to any *one* " more than to another."

Twenty five millions of people, possessed of equal rights to constitute and establish such government as best accords with the disposition, interest, and *ideal* happiness of each individual.

The legislative power, no doubt, originally emanated from the people. To deliberate upon national affairs in the aggregate is impracticable. The people being unfit to discuss public affairs, they

G

must

must act by their representatives, what they cannot act by themselves.

According to the principles proposed in the paper which is the subject of the present animadversions, the poor and unlettered mechanic has an equal right to senatorial eligibility with those who are most distinguished for their superior wisdom and property in the State. Here it should be remarked, if the latter who possess the pre-eminence of birth, riches and honors, were confounded with the common people, and to have only the weight of a single vote, like the rest, the common liberty would be their slavery; and the former, who constitute the bulk of the people, and who have neither property nor principles, would have the popular resolutions in their favour. The most perfect equality of rights can never exclude the ascendancy of superior minds; and in no society are men classed without external distinctions. The whole body of the nation must be advised by the most respectable mem-  
bers



bers of it, and their share in the legislature ought to be proportioned to the interest they have in the general security of the State. Power and property are, and ought to be, inseparable.

In the first instance of political acts, the constituents elect delegates. The majority impose a representative upon the minority. The national deputation assemble to lay the foundation, and to rear the superstructure of government.-- An assembly, which, instead of that dignity and freedom of debate which becomes the grand Council of a great nation, is characterized by levity, and the tumults of licentiousness.

The majority form a government, and frame laws binding on the minority, which, having an inherent indefeasible right to exercise their own judgment and option, because they would not approve, they would not assent to. In the name of common sense, what becomes of the sacred hereditary rights of man? Rights which appertain to *all*,

and not to any *one* more than to another!

This shews the absurdities of propositions drawn from speculative principles, without considering practicability and experience. But to what lengths will not a desperate proceed? To create anarchy at all events, they would bewilder the nation in the labyrinth of metaphysical theories, and political speculations.

“ We know of no human authority  
 “ superior to that of a whole nation. ”  
 This was penned in the plenitude of wisdom and philosophy! Had not the *Address* borne the name of a person recognized in the literary world of *politics*, but a name erased from the lists of all parties, till a recent opportunity to create mischief required talents and ingenuity, which the heads of the party would not dare openly to exercise and avow, and which few of them possessed in quality and degree better adapted to promote their common cause---Had it  
 not

not a direct tendency to poison the minds of the people by artful and malicious insinuations, it would have been equally below criticism or refutation. For there is a wide difference between the remonstrances of reason, and the insults of malice and envy, and the splenetic ebullitions of an intriguing and desperate faction.

If, for argument's sake, we suppose that a whole nation, with one heart, with one mind, with one voice, which is morally impossible, renovated or composed any form of a political constitution, where would be a cause of resistance? Unanimity precludes a collision of interests, or a competition of authority. Hence equal indefeasible rights, become a phantom, that can only exist in the disordered brains of unprincipled republicans.

“ We are immediately interested in this revolution.” Intrigue and ambition are vices represented to be inseparable from Court and Court-government.  
 “ The French have conquered for us as well  
 well



well as for themselves." For " that Court exists now no longer." The French royalty is levelled by the fatal instrument of democracy, as a tree falls whose roots the *axe* has severed. The French having given us this magnificent example, their revolution concerns us immediately. But they have not yet conquered for the party. While Englishmen are sensible of the blessings of a mild government, of peace and tranquillity, of the safety and security of their persons and property, and of the most substantial freedom ever yet enjoyed by man, they never shall conquer for those ungrateful *few*, who presumptuously personate the whole kingdom by adopting the plural pronouns of *We* and *Us*.

" Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, that would infuse deadly poison into the bosom of that country that cherishes and protects you, flee from the just resentment of an injured and indignant people."

" We

“ We are burthened with a heavy national debt.” Admitted. But from what cause has this debt originated? Was it from the intrigue and ambition of the British Court? No! The author, once for all, will instance the American war, as the prolific source of factious complaints. It would be superfluous to enter into a general view of its cause and effects. Suffice it to point out the prejudicial influence of faction on the councils and measures of Government. The following observation will apply to cases, too many to be now enumerated, and some of a very recent date:—

It is not a singular opinion that the grand transatlantic rebellion had terminated without much waste of blood or treasure, if our ungrateful American brethren, however supported by a neighbouring nation, had not been also supported by *traitors* in this country. What encouragement, what advantages of communication, must they have derived from British *patriots*, from persons

sons of the brightest talents, and whose sagacity could penetrate and develop the most private councils and plans of administration! No wonder, as our councils were anticipated, counteracted, and defeated at home, our arms should be unsuccessful abroad—and when some of our first Statesmen mingled their tears over the fate of Montgomery, and exulted in the victories of Washington. Immense was the accession of debt to the national incumbrances from this unfortunate and long-continued contest. It was procrastinated by faction; to faction the bulk of this debt is to be imputed; and not to the intrigue and ambition of Court-government, whose object was rather the happiness and prosperity of this kingdom, and eventually of its American dependencies.

But the incessant complaints of a selfish and factious people against all administrations, resemble the conduct of the Carthaginian armies, which in the moment



ment of danger and trial, deserted their General, and then crucified him because he did not *gain* the *victory*.

“ We hold, that a moral obligation  
 “ of providing for old age, helpless in-  
 “ fancy, and poverty, is far superior to  
 “ that of supplying the invented wants  
 “ of courtly extravagance, ambition,  
 “ and intrigue.” This doctrine seems  
 well from the Chairman, a quondam  
 Divine ; and which a superficial obser-  
 ver would applaud ;—but it is hypocrisy  
 and deceit. Old age, helpless infancy,  
 and poverty, have a bountiful provision  
 in this country, unequalled in the uni-  
 verse. But perhaps the lower order of  
 mechanics and labouring people are here  
 intended.—“ We have nothing to fear  
 from the poor, for we plead their cause!”  
 The common people, who make up the  
 majority of the nation, are wanted in the  
 scale of sedition ; but who are not yet in-  
 sensible of the blessings of equitable and  
 impartial laws, nor of the generous in-  
 dulgence of Government. For in per-

H

forming

forming the invidious task of raising the necessary supplies by additional taxes, the minister of finance is particularly scrupulous in exempting *the poor*, as much as possible, from their operation. But do these charitable men practise what they would seem to approve and promote? Do they remit any of their indigent tenants rents? Or increase the price of their labourers? Not a doit! "But they would feed them with a neighbour's ewe-lamb;" or say to the naked be ye clothed, and to the hungry be ye full, and leave them unrelieved.

But there is another description of men who are to be included under the denomination of poor. It has already been observed, that the poor and unfortunate, properly speaking, have the most ample and comfortable provision. The passage quoted, therefore, cannot relate to *them*. It must be *those* then who *want* money to lavish in the support of vanity, luxury, effeminacy, the splendor of dress, equipage, furniture, enter-

ertainments—and above all, to supply their exhausted funds for gaming.

The profusion of modern patriots, creates new and pressing necessities, which *honour* points to cabal and rapacity to supply. Hence their boundless and unwarranted pursuit of lucrative employments, for the gratification of these unmanly passions. Hence the national union is interrupted. Hence not only the consistency of all public measures, but their vigor and expedition are weakened or thwarted. Thus a system of political interest is established among us for the end of dissipation.

To supply the *invented* wants of these demagogues, who are equally dissolute in opinion and practice, is far superior to the supplying of “the invented wants of courtly extravagance, ambition, and intrigue.” There is an obscurity in the meaning of “the invented wants of courtly extravagance:” But obscurity suits such a dark and insidious insinuation. If a



jealousy for the peace and happiness of a kingdom, if unwearied zeal and assiduity to promote and preserve its honour and aggrandisement, if caution and policy to defeat the treacherous stratagems and selfish pursuits of a needy and turbulent faction, be ambition and intrigue—the terms are not misapplied. These principles, however, exist, in their common acceptation, but not at court—They exist in the friends of the French Revolution.

Their “astonishment” will cease when they are told, that “no part, or  
 “any members of our government, re-  
 “probate the extinction of arbitrary  
 “power in France, or wish to see it  
 “restored.” We reprobate, however, the subversion of the Rights of Man under the pretence and sanction of that sacred principle. We reprobate the indignity and outrage offered to the Royal Family. We reprobate the violent extinction of the legitimate government—  
 Instead of proceeding with temper and  
 moderation,

moderation, to meliorate it. We reprobate the French buccaniers for confiscating the property of individuals or bodies of men—Property—which, once settled and secured by the laws of the land, and confirmed by long possession, becomes inalienable. This is the general consent of nations, and the universal voice of mankind. The French Revolution having been fraught with rapacity, disloyalty, murder, cruelty, and injustice, has and deserves our hearty reprobation.

“ It is the policy of courts and court-  
 “ government, to prefer enemies to  
 “ friends, and a system of war to that  
 “ of peace, as affording more pretences  
 “ for places, offices, pensions, revenue,  
 “ and taxation ; it is high time for the  
 “ people (here prudence suppressed  
 what evil-disposed minds are left to  
 explore) “ to look with circumspection  
 “ to their own interests.” Mean, il-  
 liberal, and unjust are these suggestions.  
 —How dastardly are those spirits who  
 attack

attack with poisoned arrows, whom they can neither encounter or subdue by strength of reason and justice.—What enemies are preferred to friends? In what instance has a system of war been preferred to that of honourable peace?—But places, offices, and pensions are the grievances! The two first, however, in the glaring absence of generous religion, disinterestedness and political integrity in the governed, are essential to the very existence of government. The last are the well-earned remuneration of eminent services to the state.

“Those who pay the expence, and  
 “*not* those who participate in the  
 “emoluments arising from them, are  
 “the persons immediately interested in  
 “the abolition of places, offices, and  
 “pensions.” *When* these reformers  
 have *succeeded* in their object, *they*  
 will, no doubt, with a public spirit,  
 offer their services in the different de-  
 partments of the state, without emolu-  
 ment or reward!

“We



“ We consider the present opportunity of the French Revolution as a most happy one for lessening the enormous load of taxes under which this nation groans.”—Patriot offerings—church lands—the sacred utensils of the altar—the reduction of overgrown wealth—even chartered rights and charitable institutions, if productive, will all contribute to this great purpose. “ If this is not done ! ”—A *menace* is manifestly intended here—but it is the menace of a Liliputian tribe against the invincible Gullivers of the British constitution.

These pretended patriots wish to arrogate to themselves a merit which the minister has long ago anticipated. Has he not commenced a plan of liquidating the public debts ? Why has he not credit for his good intentions, and confidence in his future conduct, which the past has so well deserved ? The finances of this country will be retrieved, and its happiness and prosperity established and secured be-

yond example, by the wisdom, integrity, and unshaken courage of the present administration.

“ We think it also necessary to express our astonishment that a government, desirous of being called *free*, should prefer connections with the most despotic and arbitrary power in Europe.” Why not—if greater commercial advantages may be obtained? Britain has no concern with any particular mode of government in foreign countries.

“ Separated, as we happily are by nature, from the tumults of the continent, we reprobate all systems and intrigues which sacrifice the blessings of our natural situation.” Let us consider how far these blessings are affected by continental tumults. The ambition of the Empress of Russia is avowedly great; her dominions already are of a magnitude not generally known or considered. Her troops have evinced discipline and intrepidity inferior to none. The situation of this empire  
too

too has superior and peculiar advantages for the most extensive commerce. If the Russians cultivated traffic, they would, of course, regard their navy and improve it for its protection; and which, in return, would supply it with experienced sailors. If the Empress then had been permitted to take possession of the European territories of the Porte—with which, most likely, she would not have been satisfied—other neighbouring powers would, probably, soon fall into the vortex of her ambition. The Russian armies and fleets, under the sway of fierce ambition, and a desire of conquest, bearing proportion to the population, and the flourishing---wide-extended trade of this boundless empire, would become a terror to *all Europe*. The author's heart, indeed, dilates with conscious pride, when he pays this just tribute of distinction to our brave soldiers and intrepid tars—that, in valour and discipline, they *greatly* excel those of all other nations



in the world. But they are neither immortal nor invincible. If a far superior fleet overspread our channel—if a far superior army approached our shores—would our cliffs protect us?—What then would become of “the blessings of our natural situation?” Whenever the balance of power in Europe fails—Britain will become the first victim to triumphant ambition, to jealousy, and to revenge!

But the nation which we preserved from impending fate, are infidels.—Cruel and presumptuous men! To grasp the sceptre of Omnipotence, and to usurp the distribution of eternal justice! Their religious tenets are amenable to the tribunal of God alone!

As men they claim from us, individually, the offices of humanity. As a nation, on whose existence the equilibrium in the scale of the powers of Europe depends, they demand, in policy, the interference of an effectual arbitration.

In this important business, our administration have acted with a spirit becoming the dignity of their country, and with wisdom and policy becoming their arduous and confidential situations.

The events of negotiations are often precarious ; remonstrances and arguments, drawn from reason and justice, upon these occasions, often fail of their desired effect ; but the minister, to prevent the calamities of war, and the effusion of British blood, which had been probably the consequence of a dastardly conduct, had not only the wisdom to propose equitable and salutary terms of peace, but evinced a firm courage and resolution to *enforce* them if obstinately rejected.

This small island has been said to be the “ sole *arbiter* of the affairs of “ Christendom.” Under this appropriate character, the British court never shone with greater lustre, or acted with better effect. Virtue and temperance, general humanity and sincerity, wis-

dom to plan, and courage to execute, are it's distinguishing gems, and which will make a splendid figure in the historical cabinet of this country.

The late dispute respecting Nootka Sound, has afforded another example of the rancour and malignity of faction. The question is not, of what magnitude, but whether *any* insult or injury was offered or sustained? An individual, from a sense of honour, and a tenacity of his right, will, with manliness, resent an insult to the former—and will endeavour to protect from encroachment the latter. The sense of national honour and right is, beyond comparison, greater than that of an individual. The first exceeds the last, in dignity and acuteness, far beyond the proportion of one to the whole of the people of this realm. If a Briton is so tenacious of his honour and his right—shall Britain dastardly submit to an indignity and encroachment from any power upon earth?

“ If



“ If we are asked what government  
 “ is ?—we hold it to be nothing more  
 “ or less than a national association.”  
 This answer is very indefinite ; but we  
 may form some idea of this new-fan-  
 gled government, from the tenor of  
 the address. Court-government is the  
 reiterated subject of reprobation—  
 consequently a national association can  
 mean no other kind of government,  
 and is nothing more or less than an un-  
 qualified democracy.

The author, here, cannot forbear  
 making a serious remark. He admits  
 indeed, that an individual may, with  
 perfect freedom, communicate his opi-  
 nion in private, upon a *legal topic* ; but  
 from the moment of publication, he as-  
 sumes a responsibility for it to the pub-  
 lic, who are interested in its effects. Let  
 government, let the public gravely de-  
 termine upon this important matter.  
 To them the Author appeals !

If the said address and declaration  
 breathes the spirit of liberty, it is the  
 liberty

liberty of licentiousness and downright sedition.

“ From the feudal system England “ is not yet free.”--As free as it can be, consistent with absolute un-oppressive property. But there are Lords—hated superiority of rank !

With regard to the game laws—they are salutary, and have a moral effect ; they keep the poor from habits of idleness, which is the parent of dishonesty and plunder, and often leads to an ignominious end. They are made also, very properly, a source of revenue.

What monopolies are here censured, and of “ numerous kinds” too, the Author is at a loss to comprehend. Unless they are understood to mean, that all merchants and tradesmen, whether fools or knaves, whether industrious and frugal, or idle and dissipated, should have an equal share of custom and profits apportioned to each : for it is a *notorious* fact, that many  
merchants

merchants and tradesmen accumulate large fortunes, while great numbers become *bankrupts*.

Particular privileges from letters patent may be deemed a *monopoly*. When a man has racked his brain, wasted his fortune, and a great part of his life, in the production of a work of ingenuity, and which proves of superior utility to public and domestic purposes, it is a *great hardship*, that the King, to reward past, and to encourage future inventions of art, should patronize him with an exclusive sale for a short term of years, to repay his expences and his toil, and to provide for his family.

The Indian trade is indeed circumscribed. But the public derive an ample compensation for the monopoly.

“ Rejoicing, as we sincerely do, in the freedom of others (of the French) *till* we shall happily accomplish our *own*.”

It is a matter of astonishment how a parallel can be drawn between our free government



government and the absolute monarchy of France. Let us do justice to our civil and ecclesiastical polity. We enjoy the greatest plenitude of freedom. —We enjoy a political constitution, superior to all that history hath recorded, or present times can boast. We enjoy a religious establishment, which breathes universal charity and toleration. An administration of justice that hath even silenced envy, and extends its protection to the poor and the great in an equal degree. Where each dwell safely, “every man under his vine, “and under his fig-tree,” and peace surrounds their habitations ! These are blessings which every Englishman feels, and ought to acknowledge. Compare this picture with the most admired periods of the most admired countries, and its superiority will appear eminently conspicuous. A volume might be written in proof of this assertion.

But

But there are defects irremediable in free governments. The liberty of propagating the most licentious opinions is one of the greatest. The disease is bad; but the cure would be fatal.

Thus freedom is compelled to admit an enemy, which under pretence and form of an ally, often proves fatal to her existence.

“ As for riots and tumults, let those  
 “ answer for them who endeavour to  
 “ excite and promote them.” These republicans have pronounced the sentence of their own condemnation. *We* labour to preserve the public peace. *They* labour to disturb it, and to break down every barrier of order, every restraint of law, by *stunning* the sense of the nation, and instigating an unprincipled and misinformed mob to acts of rapacity and rebellion.

To watch the plots and artifices of the enemies of our Country, and to

K

crush

crush the hydra of a malignant and dangerous faction.——

“ These are our object, and we will pursue it.”

Aldenham,  
Sept. 9, 1791.

F I N I S.

N.B. Mr. Pain has owned  
himself the author of the  
address and declaration—  
But it was at first deemed  
the production of Mr. Horne Tooke.

